

## REMARKS

Claims 1-34 stand rejected. Claims 1-34 remain pending in this patent application. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the remarks set forth below. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the claims do not add new matter to the application.

### 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-15, 17, 19-25 and 29-32 of the present application are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bentley, US Patent Number 6,591,094 (hereinafter Bentley), in view of Pepe et al., US Patent Number 5,742,905 (hereinafter Pepe). Additionally, Claims 7, 9, 16, 18, 26-28, 33 and 34 of the present application are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bentley and Pepe in view of Kim et al., US Patent Number 6,118,926.

### CLAIM 1

Applicants respectfully contend that the Bentley and Pepe references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a system for remotely controlling a device wirelessly with a portable computing device as recited in newly amended independent Claim 1. For instance, amended Claim 1 recites in part (emphasis added):

a portable computing device that uses a radio frequency (RF) technology for wirelessly transmitting a control signal based on an occurrence of a predefined time and date;

Applicants respectfully assert that the Bentley and Pepe references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a portable computing device that wirelessly transmits a control signal based on an occurrence of a predefined time and date as specifically recited in amended Claim 1. Since the Bentley and Pepe references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these elements of amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully contend that amended Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the Bentley and Pepe references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 1 is allowable over the Bentley and Pepe references.

CLAIMS 15 and 29

Based on rationale similar to that discussed above with reference to newly amended independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that newly amended independent Claims 15 and 29 are also not rendered obvious by the Bentley and Pepe references, alone or in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 15 and 29 are allowable over the Bentley and Pepe references.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of rejected Claims 1-34.

Based on the reasoning presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that amended Claims 1-34 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: Nov. 26, 2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas M. Catale  
Registration No.: 46,434

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP  
Two North Market Street, Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113

Voice: (408) 938-9060  
Facsimile: (408) 938-9069